Case3:09-cv-04998-BZ Document7 Filed12/07/09 Page1 of 4 1 SEYFARTH SHAW LLP Christian J. Rowley (SBN 187293) Email: Crowley@sevfarth.com William J. Dritsas (SBN 097523) 3 Email: wdritsas@sevfarth.com 560 Mission Street, Suite 3100 San Francisco, California 94105 4 Telephone: (415) 397-2823 5 Facsimile: (415) 397-8549 6 Attorneys for Defendants INTERSTATE MANAGEMENT COMPANY, LLC; INTERSTATE HOTELS & RESORTS, 7 INC. 8 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 IN AND FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA Case No. C09-04998 BZ 11 HOTEL & RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES HEALTH & WELFARE TRUST FUND; EAST) 12 BAY RESTAURANT & TAVERN ANSWER TO COMPLAINT FOR RETIREMENT PLAN; BILL BACIGALUPI, **DELINQUENT FRINGE BENEFIT** in his official capacity as Trustee; JAMES DU 13 CONTRIBUTIONS (ERISA §§ 502,515) PONT, in his official capacity as Trustee; LIAN) ALAN, in his official capacity as Trustee; 14 MARK CLEMENT, in his official capacity as 15 Trustee; DOUGLAS CORNFORD, in his official capacity as Trustee; THERESA ERWIN, in her official capacity as Trustee, 16 WE-LING HUBER, in her official as Trustee; and IVANA KRJCINOVIC, in her official 17 capacity as Trustee; 18 Plaintiffs, 19 V. 20 INTERSTATE HOTELS & RESORTS, INC.: 21 INTERSTATE MANAGEMENT COMPANY, LLC. dba CLAREMONT RESORT AND SPA:) 22 Defendants. 23 24 Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 8(b), Defendant INTERSTATE 25 MANAGEMENT COMPANY, LLC ("Defendant IMC") and Defendant INTERSTATE 26 HOTELS & RESORTS, INC. ("Defendant IHR") hereby answer and respond to Plaintiffs' 27 28

ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

SFI 28377804.1

	1. 2. 3. PLAI 4.	I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE Deny. Admit. Admit II. PARTIES INTIFFS Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the	
3 4 5 6	1. 2. 3. PLAI 4.	I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE Deny. Admit. Admit II. PARTIES INTIFFS Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the	
5 6	2. 3. PLAI 4.	Deny. Admit. Admit II. PARTIES INTIFFS Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the	
5	2. 3. PLAI 4.	Deny. Admit. Admit II. PARTIES INTIFFS Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the	
6	2. 3. PLAI 4.	Admit. Admit II. PARTIES ENTIFFS Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the	
	3. PLAI 4.	Admit II. PARTIES INTIFFS Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the	
7	A. <u>PLAI</u> 4.	II. <u>PARTIES</u> INTIFFS Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the	
	4.	NTIFFS Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the	
$\left\ \mathbf{a} \right\ _{\mathbf{A}}$	4.	Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the	
9			
10 tr		llegations herein, and consequently, deny the same.	
11	5.	Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the	
12 tr	ruth of the al	llegations herein, and consequently, deny the same.	
13	6.	Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the	
14 tr	truth of the allegations herein, and consequently, deny the same.		
15 B	3. <u>DEF</u> I	ENDANTS	
16	7.	Deny.	
17	8.	Defendant IMC admits that it is a Delaware liability company but denies that it	
18 W	was an agent of Interstate Hotels and Resorts, Inc. ("IHR"). Defendant IHR is simply a holding		
19 c	company with a 1% ownership interest in IMC, and is not a proper party to this case. Except as		
20	so stated, Defendants deny the allegations contained in this paragraph.		
21		III. STATEMENT OF FACTS	
22	9.	Defendant IMC admits it entered into the Claremont MOU. Defendants,	
23 h	nowever, den	by that Defendant IMC that it was acting as an agent of Defendant IHR. Except as	
24 s	o stated, De	fendants deny the allegations contained in this paragraph.	
25	10.	Defendant IMC admits that the Claremont MOU provided that certain employer	
26 c	contributions	had to be made by Defendant IMC to the fund under certain circumstances. Except	
	is so stated, I	Defendants deny the allegations contained in this paragraph.	
28			
si	F1 28377804.1	ANGWED TO COMPLAINT	

- 11. Defendant IMC admits that the Claremont MOU obligated it to make some contributions to the fund at certain times under certain circumstances. Except as so stated, Defendant IMC denies the allegation contained herein.
- 12. Defendant hereby admits that on or about September 8, 2007, someone on behalf of the fund performed an "audit" on the property known as the Claremont Hotel and Spa for the period of January 1, 2006 through January 31, 2007. Defendant IMC further admits that the "audit" found purported contribution deficiencies, but denies it is liable for those deficiencies. Except as so stated, Defendant IMC denies the allegation contained herein.
- 13. Defendant IMC admits that it received a bill from the funds' auditor on or about September 30, 2008, asserting an alleged liability in the amounts noted. Except as so stated, Defendant IMC denies the allegation contained herein.
- 14. Defendants lack knowledge and information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations herein, and consequently, deny the same.

IV. CAUSE OF ACTION FIRST CLAIM

FAILURE TO MAKE BENEFIT CONTRIBUTIONS

(29 U.S.C. §§ 1132(a)(3)(B)(ii) and 1132(g)(2)(e))

- 15. Defendant IMC denies it is liable for delinquent fringe benefit contributions.

 Defendant IMC admits the Plaintiffs purport to make a claim for alleged contributions under the statutory provisions noted. Except as so stated, Defendant IMC denies the allegations contained herein.
 - 16. Deny.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

First Affirmative Defense

(Laches & Unclean Hands)

1. Plaintiffs' claim is barred by the doctrine of laches and unclean hands.

Second Affirmative Defense

(Mandatory Arbitration)

2. Plaintiffs' claim is subject to binding mandatory arbitration.

SF1 28377804.1 3
ANSWER TO COMPLAINT

Case3:09-cv-04998-BZ Document7 Filed12/07/09 Page4 of 4

1		Third Affirmative Defense			
2		(Satisfaction)			
3	3.	Defendant IMC has satisfied some or all of the alleged liability.			
4		Fourth Affirmative Defense			
5		(12(b)(6) Failure to State a Claim)			
6	4.	Plaintiffs have failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.			
7		Fifth Affirmative Defense			
8		(Limitations Period)			
9	5.	Plaintiffs' claim is barred by the applicable statute of limitations.			
10		Sixth Affirmative Defense			
11		(Failure to Exhaust)			
12	6.	Plaintiffs have failed to exhaust contractual pre-requisites to the claim.			
13		PRAYER FOR RELIEF			
14	Based	d on the foregoing Defendants respectfully asks that the Court:			
15	1.	Dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint in its entirety and enter judgment in their favor.			
16	2.	Award them their reasonable costs and attorneys' fees.			
17	DATED: Dec	cember 7, 2009 SEYFARTH SHAWLLP			
18	DiffED. Dec	SETTAKAT SITA WILD			
19		Ru A			
20		Christian J. Rowley Attorneys for Defendants			
$\begin{bmatrix} 20 \\ 21 \end{bmatrix}$		INTERSTATE MANAGEMENT COMPANY, LLC; INTERSTATE			
		HOTELS & RESORTS, INC.			
22					
23					
28					
	SF1 28377804.1	SEL 28377804.1 4 ANSWER TO COMPLAINT			
24 25 26 27 28	SF1 28377804.1	4 ANSWER TO COMPLAINT			